



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

(e. g., his story of the proprietaries' wealth), in the partisan *Historical Review*, he yet follows him in other statements not less unsound. Confidence is given in several places to his quips and jokes, his egotistical personal narratives, and his averments and arguments made to serve a temporary controversial purpose. It may be noted at this point that the statement (p. 351) that "among the many tenets of the Quakers, the one which concerned the taking of an oath was probably the most prominent," is not doing justice to Dr. Shepherd's own acquaintance with the Friends; relatively, this "testimony" was a minor one, though in their troubles over the administration of the government their enemies made it play an important part.

On page 324 it is stated that the people of Delaware were (about the period of the separation from Pennsylvania, 1704) "for the most part of Dutch and Swedish parentage." This could be fairly said only of Newcastle county; Kent and Sussex, especially the latter, were and long remained strongly of English blood. On page 545 is given a list of the "German religious sects," whose members were emigrants to Pennsylvania before 1755, in which the Lutherans and German Reformed, who formed probably the majority, are not mentioned.

HOWARD M. JENKINS.

*The Literary History of the American Revolution, 1763-1783.* By MOSES COIT TYLER, Professor of American History in Cornell University. Vol. I., 1763-1776. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1897. Pp. xxxi, 521).

ALTHOUGH the title does not announce it, the present work must really be considered not so much a distinct study, as a sequel to the *History of American Literature during the Colonial Time*, issued by the same author several years ago. It is true that the new book stands for itself and by itself, but a survey of the literature of the Revolution which passes over some of the leading writers with scarcely a reference, is either to be blamed as defective, or such omissions are to be explained by reference to an earlier work. In the present volume, the writings of Thomas Hutchinson find scarcely a mention, except for his *Strictures* on the Declaration of Independence, and three quotations from private letters serve to dismiss Franklin from consideration, though his famous *Examination* was the first political pamphlet which really broke through the colony boundaries. The explanation is, of course, that these and other writers had already been treated in the earlier work; but we think a note to this effect in the preface would, on the whole, have been worth the making.

Another point on which there is room for question is the neglect of a very essential class of writers. In the sense of an American literature produced on our own soil, no objection can be made to the omission of this class, but the title suggests no such distinction, and a *Literary History of the American Revolution* can scarcely be considered complete

without reference to the writings of John Huske, William Bollan, William Knox, and Thomas Pownall, all of whom, though they wrote and published in England, nevertheless were of either American birth or residence.

But since Professor Tyler has drawn these lines of demarcation, and deliberately elects not to consider the writers already treated by him in his previous work, or those whose labors were done in Great Britain, this criticism cannot be considered as material, since it is only fair to judge a book by the author's evident intention. From this standpoint it is far and away the best treatment of the literature of those years of turmoil yet written, so careful and accurate, so full and discriminating, that it must stand apart from all previous attempts. Professor Tyler has read, one can say absorbed, everything that is material in the controversial battles, no skit or broadside even being too ephemeral to be cast aside as worthless. From this mass of material he has culled the interesting, the distinctive or the typical, and has so arranged and framed his literary mosaic, that a vivid picture is presented, not merely of the literature of the times, but of the very minds of a people. Had he but extended his studies one point further, and added a survey of the newspapers, which fought half the battle at least, his work would stand preëminent, not merely as a history of the writing of the period, but of all the intellectual forces acting upon a fresh-minded, clear-headed people. He explains the omission by stating that the newspaper then occupied a "subordinate place" as compared with the pamphlet, but in this we must take issue with him. Otis, Adams, Franklin, Dickinson, and others of the same type, did the larger part of their work through the American press, and their choice of this vehicle for public appeal shows the influence of the fourth estate at that time.

Considering points more in detail, the author calls attention to two hitherto unnoticed works on trade: *An Essay on the Trade of the Northern Colonies*, and *Some Thoughts on the Method of Improving and Securing the Advantages which accrue to Great Britain from the Northern Colonies*, but he has no clue to the authorship of either. They were both merely newspaper articles, the first being printed in the *Pennsylvania Journal* and the last in the *New York Mercury*, though both were reprinted in London as pamphlets. The second was written by Archibald Kennedy and the probabilities are that the first was also. He was an early and somewhat prolific American writer on trade, of considerable ability, who has been singularly neglected, except by Appleton's *Cyclopædia of Biography*, which, with its customary accuracy, kills him several years before he died.

A question on which the author has been misled by George H. Moore's pamphlet on the *Declaration of the Causes for taking up Arms*, concerns the authorship of that piece. Dr. Moore proved to his own satisfaction that Jefferson, in his words, "lied" in claiming a material share in the authorship of this paper, but his pamphlet was written before Jefferson's drafts were discovered. They have since been printed,

with such corrections as Dickinson wrote upon them, and they show that the larger part of the famous paper was drafted by Jefferson.

We think, in his consideration of Francis Hopkinson, it may interest Professor Tyler to glance over that author's *Errata, or the Art of Printing incorrectly*, together with Stewart's reply entitled *The Ass in the Lyon's Skin, discovered by his Braying*. The latter was almost the first publication (1764) of the "little genius" and, though bad-tempered, is distinctly entertaining. A reconsideration of the reference on page 206 to a "certain great author" will probably result in the substitution of the name of Jonathan Edwards for that of Bishop Berkeley. Finally, the question of Hamilton's age is now so debatable a point, that it is no longer wise to consider his precocity as an established fact.

PAUL LEICESTER FORD.

*History of the Transition from Provincial to Commonwealth Government in Massachusetts.* By HARRY A. CUSHING, Ph.D., Tutor in History, Columbia University. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, Columbia University, Vol. VII., Number 1.] (New York. 1896. Pp. vi, 281.)

MR. CUSHING has selected a field which has attracted the attention of many writers, but he alone has recorded in detail the results of an examination of this subject, made with scrupulous care, which covers the voluminous authorities under consideration. He has had at his command, not only the publications of the time, but also many manuscripts, and has placed before us in orderly arrangement an analysis of their contents, containing much that is new. It may be asserted that no person will be tempted to follow in his footsteps, and as a consequence this volume must stand as an authority upon the topic of which it treats, within the limits of the period investigated by the author. In respect to these limits, to questions of proportion, inclusion and omission, and to conclusions, no two scholars will wholly agree, and the reader of the book will perhaps be disposed to give preference to the opinions of the author rather than to those of the critic.

The analytical treatment of the subject by Mr. Cushing begins with the ante-Revolutionary conflict between the provincial legislature and the royal governors. The writer seeks for some hidden explanation of this and finds it in what he terms "elements of antagonism in the provincial system." Following the statement of what these elements were, is an analysis of the work of the Provincial Congress and its accessories, which is in turn followed by a full account of the abortive constitution of 1778 and an explanation of the cause of its failure. The work concludes with a description of the constitution of 1780.

The most valuable contributions to our historical knowledge are made by the chapters on the work of the Provincial Congress and on the constitution of 1778. The field here worked was fallow and the harvest was great. The student of the subject must hereafter turn to these chapters